



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,370	06/18/2007	Michel Dreano	SCHIAFFONATI I	8192
1444 7590 12/17/2008 BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303				
EXAMINER				
MERTZ, PRIMA MARIA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1646				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/583,370		DREANO ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Prema M. Mertz		1646	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Prema M. Mertz (Primary Examiner). (3) _____.

(2) Allen C. Yun (Attorney). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 December 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 19, 21-23, 25, 28, 31, 32, 40, 41, 43-46, 48, 50, 53-55 and 57-62.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kovalovich et al (2001).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The 35 USC 112, first paragraph, scope of enablement rejection and 35 USC 103 rejection over Kovalovich et al (2001) was discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

first paragraph, scope of enablement rejection and	/Prema Mertz/ Primary Examiner
--	-----------------------------------